REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 – 11, 14 - 22 and 24 – 32 and 34 - 39 are pending in this application. Claims 34 – 39 have been withdrawn from consideration and claims 2, 23 and 33 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3 – 22 and 24 – 32 were rejected in the present Office Action.

Claim 1 was rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) by U.S. Patent No. 6,194,788, issued to Gilleo in view of Japanese Publication 58103525, published by Kunitomo and U.S. Patent No. 4,546,155, issued to Hirose. Claims 3 –22 and 24 – 31 were rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Gilleo in view of Kunitomo and Hirose and further in view of JP 62-081416A, issued to Kobayashi. Claim 32 was rejected as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Gilleo in view of Kunitomo and Hirose. Claims 12 and 13 have been cancelled. The distinctions between the combinations of Gilleo and Kunitomo and Gilleo, Kunitomo and Kobayashi set forth in previous responses by Applicant are equally relevant to the present response and will not be repeated herein. The Examiner states that Hirose describes the specific imidazole-anhydride of the present invention, namely 2-phenyl-4-methyl imidazole and that that may be utilized in place of the imidazoles of Kunitomo because Hirose teaches the equivalence of the imidazoles. It is respectfully submitted that the disclosure of Hirose, in combination with the other cited references, would not lead one skilled in the art to the present invention. Hirose discloses a three component adduct which includes an epoxy, imidazole and anhydride. In direct contrast to Hirose, the composition of the present invention is a two-part adduct. There is neither a teaching in Hirose that 2-phenyl-4-methyl imidazole would work in a two component adduct that does not contain a polyfunctional epoxy nor a teaching in any other reference of a two component adduct with 2-phenyl-4-methyl imidazole. Two and three component adducts have different properties. For example, the three component adducts of Hirose cure at much lower temperatures (in the range of 100 – 120C) than the two component adduct of the present invention, which cures at temperatures in excess of 183C. Consequently, one skilled in the art would not be led by the teaching of Hirose to a two component adduct containing 2-phenyl-4-methyl imidazole.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that simply because 2-phenyl-4-methyl imidazole was in the same list in Hirose as 2-methyl imidazole that they are not equivalent. These imidazoles have various different properties which would lead one skilled in the art to use them in different combinations and the use of one would not teach one skilled in the art to use the other. For example, the melting temperatures of the two imidazoles are dramatically different. 2-phenyl-4-methyl imidazole melts at temperatures in the range of 163 – 182C, while 2-methyl imidazole melts at much lower temperatures which are in the range of 137-145C. The melting temperature would be significant in that it would determine the curing temperature of the composition. In view of the numerous differences between the combination of the cited references and the present

invention, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3 – 11, 14 – 22 and 24 – 32 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Gilleo in view of Kunitomo and Hirose and further in view of Kobayashi.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. If there are any issues that the Examiner wishes to discuss, he is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles W. Almer
Reg. No.36,731
Tel. No. 908 707-3738

National Starch and Chemical Company
10 Finderne Avenue
Bridgewater, NJ 08807
October 27, 2006